	Application No.		A	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/78	0/789,974 CARLSON, FRANCIS M.			NCIS M.	
	Exan	niner	A	rt Unit		
·	Danie	el P. Stephenson	3	672 		
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>allowed</u>						
(1) Daniel P. Stephenson.	(3	(3)				
(2) <u>Luke Santangelo</u> .	(4	(4)				
Date of Interview: <u>2 February 2007</u>	Tim	ne: <u>1:00</u>				
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ N If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's re o	presentative)				
Part I.						
Rejection(s) discussed:						
Claims discussed:  Prior art documents discussed:						
	• .					
Part II.		•				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NA	ATURE OF WHA	T WAS D	ISCUSSED:		
Part III.						
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sequirectly resulted in the allowance of the applicat of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sequid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sequirect.</li> </ul>	ion. The exam	iner will provide a	a written of the int	summary of the erview, since	ne substance	
		•				
			-			
<u> </u>						
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Apr	oplicant/Applic	ant's Representa	tive Signa	ature – if appr	opriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner related that the case was in condition for allowance except for a few changes that could be made through an examiner's amendment. A number of the preambles of the added claims seemed to be in error. In addition, some claims had improper language that would have required a rejection under USC 112. These claims were cancelled. Claim 152 was changed to positively recite that the sample was being used to measure a methane value. and somel lack of antecedent basis problems were corrected. The applicant agreed to all of the changes.